

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 20 are pending. By this amendment, claim 3 is amended to correct antecedent basis of one claim element. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

On August 31, 2006, Applicant's representative met with Examiner Sherr to discuss the claim rejections. The substance of that interview is incorporated in the remarks that follow.

On page 2 the Office Action rejects claims 1 - 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0065896 to Burakoff et al. (hereafter Burakoff). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CLAIM 1

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Burakoff discloses all the recited elements except that Burakoff does not disclose "information regarding cargo, or a government agency." However, the Office Action asserts that "it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Burakoff to deal with different types of information, and with any authority setting rules."

Burakoff is directed to a computer-based system that is used to obtain consent from a user for electronic delivery of information over the computer system. More specifically, Burakoff discloses a logging computer 20 that acts as a clearinghouse for information and for storing consent information provided by users, where the consent information refers to the user's consent to receive information electronically. That information includes "a doctor's report, insurance information, security information such as a mutual fund prospectus . . ." See paragraphs 0030 and 0046. At most, Burakoff discloses that the logging computer 20 may provide information required by a federal agency (as disclosed, the SEC). See paragraph 0053. However, providing information required by a government agency is not the same as, and does not suggest, "a set of rules for operation of the GCCIC, wherein one or more of the rules is acknowledged by a government agency."

In contrast to Burakoff, claim 1 recites "a Cargo Container Information Clearinghouse . . . comprising . . . a central information repository wherein information related to the transportation of goods is processed and stored . . . and a set of rules for operation of the GCCIC, wherein one or more rules is acknowledged by a government agency." As agreed to at the personal interview,

and as discussed above, at least these elements of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by Burakoff. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable.

CLAIMS 2 - 4

In rejecting claims 2 - 4, the Office Action asserts that Burakoff discloses all that is recited, except that Burakoff does not disclose information regarding cargo. As discussed during the personal interview, Burakoff does not disclose or suggest all the features of these claims. For example, Burakoff does not disclose a system that comprises “risk assessments, data mining, transaction insurance, data archiving and trend analysis.” See claim 3. Also, Burakoff does not disclose “an incentives program to encourage compliance with the set of rules for operation of the GCCIC; and an enforcement program to ensure compliance with the set of rules.” See claim 4. In addition to these features, and others recited in claims 2 - 4, claims 2 - 4 depend from patentable claim 1. For these reasons, claims 2 - 4 are patentable.

CLAIM 5

The rejection of claim 5 is stated in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Office Action. This rejection repeats essentially the rejection of claim 1, and as agreed to at the personal interview, Burakoff does not disclose or suggest all the features of claim 5. Accordingly, claim 5 is patentable.

CLAIMS 6 and 7

In rejecting these claims, the Examiner, in paragraphs 11 and 12, states that Burakoff discloses commercial entities paying a fee for services and products provided through the operating entity, and a service provider that provides technical assistance and products. However, nowhere does Burakoff ever disclose a fee or technical services. Therefore, Burakoff does not disclose all the elements of claims 6 and 7. In addition, claims 6 and 7 depend from patentable claim 5. For these reasons, claims 6 and 7 are also patentable.

CLAIM 8

The rejection of independent claim 8 is stated in paragraphs 13 and 14. Claim 8 includes many of the elements of claims 1 and 5, including elements which the Examiner admitted during the personal interview, are not disclosed or suggested by Burakoff. Accordingly, claim 8 is patentable.

CLAIMS 9 and 10

Claims 9 and 10 recite features not disclosed or suggested by Burakoff, namely an incentives program (claim 9) and a risk assessment (claim 10). In addition, claims 9 and 10 depend from patentable claim 8. for these reasons, claims 9 and 10 are patentable.

CLAIM 11

Claim 11 is an independent method claim that recites steps corresponding to the elements of apparatus claims 1 and 5. As with claims 1 and 5, many of these steps are not disclosed or suggested by Burakoff. Accordingly, claim 11 is patentable.

CLAIMS 12 - 20

Claims 12 - 20 depend from patentable claim 11, and for this reason and the additional features they recite, claims 12 - 20 are also patentable.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: September 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


John K. Harrop
Registration No. 41,817
Andrews Kurth LLP
1350 I Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739